

# Minutes

# City of Loma Linda

*Department of Community Development*

## Planning Commission

Chair Neff called a regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, March 3, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

**Commissioners Present:** Randy Neff, Chair  
Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Vice Chair  
Michael Christianson, Alternate  
Shakil Patel

**Commissioners Absent:** Eric Essex

**Staff Present:** Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development  
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety  
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner  
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department  
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

**Consultant:** Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

### ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted. However, Director Woldruff requested that the items be taken out of order to allow the applicant for SPA No. 03-06 to leave once the item has been resolved, since the General Plan Update Project could result in a lengthy discussion. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to address Item 2 under New Items, Public Hearing at the beginning of the meeting.

### ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no oral reports

### CONTINUED ITEMS

#### PUBLIC HEARING

**PC-04-15 - SMALL PROJECT APPLICATION (SPA) NO. 03-06 – The applicant is appealing a staff decision to require the removal of an existing driveway and approach on Mission Road, which is part of the approval for a garage conversion, construction of a new two-car garage and room addition at the rear on their property located at 25806 Mission Road. The project site is located in the (R1) Single Family Residence Zone (APN #0292-261-07)**

Assistant Planner Colunga gave the staff report. He explained that the applicant was requesting that the Planning Commission consider her appeal of a staff decision to require the removal of an existing driveway approach on Mission Road.

Mr. Colunga reported that the application came to the department as a Small Project Application (SPA No. 03-06), and went before the Administrative Review Committee and subsequently to an Administrative Hearing, which occurred on June 16, 2003. He described the project as being a proposal to convert a two-car garage to a family room, and construct a new, two-car garage with access off of Oak Street, and a new, bedroom. He added that the project was approved with conditions and an approval letter was forwarded to Ms. Gile along with the Conditions of Approval. Mr. Colunga informed the Commission that Condition No. 5 required that the original driveway on Mission Road be removed and the property landscaped.

Mr. Colunga explained that Ms. Gile was requesting that she receive approval to keep both driveways. He added that she was also requesting a fee waiver of \$800; this request would go before the City Council for consideration.

Director Woldruff explained that Ms. Gile had been told about the condition and that the Community Development Department had not been aware that the original driveway was not removed until the final inspection was performed. Associate Engineer Peterson added that he, along with Field Supervisor Eleazar Rubalcava, had met with Ms. Gile and that the removal of the driveway was shown on the plans approved through the plan check process.

Therefore, staff was recommending that the Planning Commission deny the appeal and uphold staff's decision requesting the removal of the driveway onto Mission Road.

Chair Neff opened the public comment at 7:15 pm.

Ms. Orchid Gile, 25806 Mission Road addressed the Commission to explain that she had requested the permission to keep the driveway on Mission Road because her elderly mother lived with her and that when her mother's friends came to pick her up for an outing, the vehicle had to be parked on Mission Road. She added that for the safety of her mother and her friends she was requesting that she be able to keep the original driveway.

Upon questioning by the Commissioners, Ms. Gile replied that she knew of the requirement to remove the driveway, but had not realized what the impact would be.

Director Woldruff commented that the Loma Linda Municipal Code Title 17 required that a driveway lead to a covered and enclosed two-car garage space, that the City's policy was that access to each single-family residential lot is provided by one driveway and approach, and finally that staff anticipated an increase in traffic on Mission Road as a result of several large development projects in the area. She added that staff would not be approving any new driveway approaches on Mission Road.

Chair Neff closed the public comment period at 7:30 pm.

The discussion continued on the issue and the following motion was formulated.

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Rosenbaum, and carried by a vote of 3-1, Patel in opposition, to deny the Appeal and uphold staff's decision regarding the removal of the existing driveway and approach on Mission Road, and to replace it with landscaping, sidewalk and full-height curb and gutter as required by Condition 5 of the Conditions of Approval.**

Director Woldruff explained that the applicant's request for a waiver of the Appeal fee would be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration.

**PC-04-16 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT - The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.**

Director Woldruff gave the staff report stating that on February 11, 2004, the Planning Commission held the first Public Hearing for the General Plan Update Project where staff and the consultant provided background information on the development of the Draft General Plan (January 2004) over the past three years and the process to achieve the final draft document. She continued to say that a lot of time was spent discussing land use issues, in particular the South Hills Mixed-Use issue, and that staff and the consultant had been working on a resolution to those issues; but because the document is quite voluminous, she suggested that a summary of the previous meeting be provided along with a brief outline of options for a possible resolution and move forward and discuss a new section of the Plan at each meeting.

Director Woldruff provided the Planning Commission with a recommendation that the Commission to continue the review of the Draft General Plan, receive public testimony, and advise staff of any

changes or revisions. Staff also recommended that the Planning Commission continue its review of the Land Use Element as follows:

Land Use Element (2.0)

- Employment Generating Land Use Designations (2.2.4)
- Policies For Employment Generating Land Use (2.2.5)
- Community And Public Land Use Designations (2.2.6)
- Policies For Community And Public Land Uses (2.2.7)
- Mixed-Use Land Use (2.2.8)
- Estimated Population, Households, And Employment At Future Build out Date (2.3)

Introduction to General Plan Elements (1.0)

- All sections

Community Design Element (3.0)

- All sections

Director Woldruff reported that at the meeting of February 11, 2004, the public testimony received on the issues and concerns listed below prompted an extensive discussion.

- Slope/density formula contained in the Hillside/Mixed Use Designation - too restrictive;
- Guiding Policies of the Hillside/Mixed Use Designation - too restrictive, particularly the grading policies;
- Draft General Plan – lack of a vision statement for the future of the City of Loma Linda;
- Mixed Use Designation – too much acreage;
- Traffic and parking issues related to increased residential uses allowed in the Mixed Use Designation;
- Trails System - not addressed very thoroughly;
- Need for more designated truck routes due to increases in commercial traffic.

Director Woldruff concluded her report and stated that staff would bring the Draft General Plan back to the Planning Commission after all public testimony had been received on the various elements with potential revisions for the complete Plan.

In order to move the General Plan Update Project forward in an organized and efficient manner, staff proposed that each Public Hearing at the Planning Commission level be devoted to the review of specified Elements. Staff therefore suggested that the Planning Commission review the remaining sections of the Land Use Element and other specified Elements that are outlined below and take public testimony.

Land Use Element (2.0)

- Employment Generating Land Use Designations (2.2.4)
- Policies For Employment Generating Land Use (2.2.5)
- Community And Public Land Use Designations (2.2.6)
- Policies For Community And Public Land Uses (2.2.7)
- Mixed-Use Land Use (2.2.8)
- Estimated Population, Households, And Employment At Future Build out Date (2.3)

Introduction to General Plan Elements (1.0)

- All sections

Community Design Element (3.0)

- All sections

Director Woldruff acknowledged the letters of comment that were received prior to and during the February 11, 2004 Planning Commission meeting. Copies of the letters would be included as an attachment these minutes. She reminded the Commission that the major item of discussion was slope formula for the South Hills, the Lack of Vision of the Draft General Plan and that the Mixed Use designation encompassed too many acres. Developers in the audience

stated that the Mixed Use designation for the South Hills area was too restrictive and would not allow an efficient use of their properties.

Chair Neff opened public comment at 8:10 pm.

Mr. Chris Taylor, Empire Homes, 20 Corporate Park, Ste 240, Irvine CA, addressed the Commission on behalf of his clients to present his concerns on the Land Use Designation in the South Hills. He pointed out that there was only one designation, and that there was no street alignment that reached into that area. He continued to say that if the Planning Commission did not recommend a change in designation for the South Hills, Empire Homes would not be able to develop the property for their clients.

Mr. Taylor explained that Empire Homes was interested in scheduling a workshop to present their development plans to show the Planning Commission what the project would look like. Director Woldruff explained that it was uncommon to discuss a project that had not been formally submitted for a preliminary review.

Chair Neff opened the discussion with the review of Element 2 - Land Use Element of Page 2-11, Section 2.2.4 - Employment Generating Land Use Designations.

#### Element 2 – Land Use Element

- 2.2.4 - Employment generation. Add “hotels” to the language for employment generation uses.
- 2.2.8 - Mixed Use Land Designation.
- Document says five general areas when actually there are ten. Corrections to be made.
- Section 2.2.8.1 - Mixed Use Area “A” – Loma Linda Academy Area (West of proposed future Evans Street Alignment - Change the description to clarify the location of Area A.

Mr. Zola provided clarification and justification for the following Mixed Use areas:

- 2.2.8.1 – Mixed Use Area A – Loma Linda Academy – To deal vacant properties and open spaces and provide an opportunity for commercial and restaurant uses.
- 2.2.8.2 – Mixed Use Area B – Anderson and Van Leuven Area – Remedy circulation problem through the area and open opportunity for higher density and commercial uses.
- 2.2.8.3 - Mixed Use Area C – University Village – To create a downtown concept and allow high density development, expansion of the university, commercial uses, and student housing for smart growth.
- 2.2.8.4 - Mixed Use Area D – Redlands Boulevard and California Street – To accommodate development for commercial, and office uses and to keep residential development on Mission Road from fronting on California Street.
- 2.2.8.5 – Mixed Use E - Mission Road – To allow for a historical area.
- 2.2.8.6 - Mixed Use F – San Timoteo Creek at Barton Road – Provide some flexibility to a very small area.
- 2.2.8.7. – Mixed Use Area G – This area is similar to Mixed Use Area D and is an extension of Mixed Use Areas E, G & H. Characteristics are different and proposed projects would be in the county area within the city's sphere.
- 2.2.8.8 - Mixed Use Area H – East Barton Road – This is an unincorporated area.
- 2.2.8.9 - Mixed Use Area I – Town Center – Projects in could be other types of development not simply traditional commercial venues. It is possible to get a walkable community in this area of the city that could accommodate parking structures, which are better than flat parking

Mr. Glenn Elssmann, 24949 Prospect Street, Loma Linda, commented that Area I could be an appropriate area for a hotel project. Mr. Zola will add language to the text to include hotel projects. In reply to a question by Mr. Elssmann on development in Area D, Mr. Zola explained

that the projects would have to provide a master plan through a Precise Plan of Design (PPD) to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Chair Neff proceeded to Section 2.3 – Estimated Population, Households, and Employment at Future Build Out Date. Director Woldruff explained that the language in that section would need to be changed only if the Planning Commission recommended changes in land uses that would necessitate changes to the calculations. She suggested that the section be revisited once the review of the Draft General Plan document was completed.

#### Element 3 – Community Design Element

Mr. Zola stressed the fact that the Community Design Element was designed with developers in mind so they can read the sections and design their project accordingly.

Chair Neff began the discussion on the Community Design Element by suggesting that the same approach be used, and each type of development revised if the Commission had any questions.

3.1.1 – Pedestrian-Oriented Development – Guiding Policy 3.1.1.1 (k) – add “and sun” to the end of the sentence.

Mr. Elssmann suggested that a Transit component be added in Circulation Element.

3.1.2 – Auto-Oriented Commercial and Small Office Development – The Commissioners had nothing to add.

3.1.3 – Big Box Development – Mr. Zola explained that they would be recommended for an industrial sector such as California Street or Richardson Street areas. The designation refers to a type of business.

3.1.4 – Hospitality Development – This section includes hotels, restaurant and would distinguish between restaurants and fast food and the types of hotel such as extended stay hotels, etc. Commissioner Rosenbaum commented that for extended stay hotels project, other conveniences and related services could be located in the vicinity of the hotel.

3.1.5 – Convenience Development – This section would include fast foods, drive through restaurant, etc. The Planning Commission suggested that reference to the use of bright or fluorescent colors where they are acceptable for ease of use by consumers be added.

Chair Neff concluded the discussion on Page 3-8. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that the discussion would resume with Section 3.1.6 at the next meeting.

On a request by Chair Neff, Director Woldruff suggested that a similar approach be taken and the following sections be reviewed at the next meeting: Complete Element 3, Element 1 – Introduction to General Plan Elements, Element 4 - Economic Development, Element 6 – Transportation, and Element 7 – Noise.

**PC-04-17 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes of the Special meeting of November 19, 2003, the Minutes of the Regular meeting of December 3, 2003, Minutes of the Special meeting of December 17, 2003, and Minutes of the Adjourned Regular meeting of February 11, 2004.**

There were no revisions to the above referenced minutes.

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Rosenbaum, and unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of the Special meeting of November 19, 2003, the Minutes of the Regular meeting of December 3, 2003, Minutes of the Special meeting of December 17, 2003, and Minutes of the Adjourned Regular meeting of February 11, 2004, as presented by staff.**

#### **REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

Commissioner Christianson suggested that the Planning Commission might like to send a floral arrangement to Commissioner Essex with a get-well wish. Director Woldruff replied that it had already been done in the Planning Commission's name.

#### **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT**

Community Development Director Woldruff reported that there are many projects that are in the working stages and it appeared that it would be a busy spring season. She added that staff planned to bring the issue of the Development Code Amendment (DCA) on the Mission Road Historical Overlay District and a Draft Street Naming Program before the City Council on March 9, 2004.

Director Woldruff stated that staff was gearing up for the 2004-2005 budget, changing to a new fee schedule effective March 1, 2004. She added that with the heavy schedule facing them, the department was being re-carpeted and staff had to box up files and furniture to allow the work to be done.

Commissioner Christianson asked about the procedure for naming of the Mission Road Historic Overlay District. Director Woldruff replied that nothing had been established for this time being but that it would go through the usual approval process starting with the Historical Commission.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion by Neff, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to adjourn to a special meeting on March 17, 2004. (Patel and Essex absent)**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Minutes approved at the regular meeting of April 28, 2004.

---

Administrative Secretary

*I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\04Mar03M-app.doc*